

### **Remarks**

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the claim deletions above and comments which follow. While the indicated allowability of Claim 8 and 28 is gratefully acknowledged, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, as explained further below.

The examiner has rejected independent Claims 1 and 11 as being anticipated by each of Drozdewicz et al. (US2002/0091769), Jonsson (US6,272,214) and Doganata et al. (US6,798,753). He has also rejected the independent claims on the basis of obviousness with respect to Summers et al. (US6,876,734) in view of Linden et al. (6,549,773). Applicants believe that this view is incorrect because none of these references discloses the association of time ranges with each of a plurality of call destinations or selection of an appropriate one of the plurality of call ranges according to a comparison of the current time with the associated time ranges. Applicants detail below an analysis of each of these cited references and their relevance to the subject-matter of the independent claims.

Drozdewicz et al. relates to a method for establishing a conference call between a plurality of participants. The examiner has not cited any particular passage of this document with reference to any of the features of claims 1 or 11. However, it appears that he believes that the fact that the "usage of [a] web server, conferencing system, URL, [and the] internet" is disclosed amounts to disclosure of all of the subject-matter of claims 1 and 11. This is not the case because the subject-matter of the independent claims amounts to more than the mere coupling together of a conferencing system and web server to enable access to the conferencing system via a URL over the Internet.

In fact, Drozdewicz et al. is barely of any relevance to the subject-matter of the independent claims of this application beyond the fact that it relates to establishing telephone calls using a web-enabled conferencing system. Applicants have reviewed the document carefully, and it makes no mention whatsoever of associating time ranges with each of the plurality of participants or comparing the current time with each of the associated ranges or selection of an appropriate one of the plurality of call destinations depending on the outcome of the comparison of the

current time with the time ranges. Drozdewicz et al. therefore does not anticipate claim 1 or claim 11 of the present application.

Jonsson et al. relates to a method for implementing an automated teleconference. Again, the examiner has made a broad reference of the whole of columns 3 and 4 in support of his assertion that the independent claims are anticipated by Jonsson et al. However, review of these columns (and indeed the rest of Jonsson et al.) shows that there is no mention whatsoever of associating time ranges with each of the plurality of participants or comparing the current time with each of the associated ranges or selection of an appropriate one of the plurality of call destinations depending on the outcome of the comparison of the current time with the time ranges. In fact, time is only mentioned in the context of column 5, lines 13 to 15, which indicate that a session may be scheduled to occur at a specific date and time. This is not the same as associated a range of times with each of the plurality of participants. Thus, Jonsson et al. does not anticipate claim 1 or claim 11 of the present application.

Similar comments apply to Doganata et al. as to Jonsson et al. Doganata et al. discloses a method of automatically establishing a conference call. The examiner has cited columns 3 and 4 in support of his assertion of that the independent claims are anticipated by Doganata et al. However, review of these columns (and indeed the rest of Jonsson et al.) shows that there is no mention whatsoever of associating time ranges with each of the plurality of participants or comparing the current time with each of the associated ranges or selection of an appropriate one of the plurality of call destinations depending on the outcome of the comparison of the current time with the time ranges. Again, time is only mentioned in the same context as in Jonsson et al., namely to indicate that a session may be scheduled to occur at a specific date and time.

The examiner has referred in particular to the "usage of [a] web server, conference scheduling device, URL, [and the] internet" as being of relevance. However, as pointed out in the above comments on Drozdewicz et al. the subject-matter of the independent claims amounts to more than the mere coupling together of a conference scheduling device and web server to enable access to the conferencing

system via a URL over the Internet. Thus, Doganata et al. does not anticipate Claims 1 and 11 of the present application.

With respect to the obviousness rejection based on Summers et al. in view of Linden et al., neither reference discloses associating time ranges with each of the plurality of participants or comparing the current time with each of the associated ranges or selection of an appropriate one of the plurality of call destinations depending on the outcome of the comparison of the current time with the time ranges. The skilled person could not therefore arrive at the invention by combining the subject-matter of these two references, both of which are so-lacking.

From his comments, it appears that the examiner believes that Summers et al. discloses all of the features of Claims 1 and 11 with the exception of the use of a URL. However, this is incorrect. Taking each of the sections of Summers et al. cited by the examiner in turn: column 3, lines 27 to 54 does not disclose receiving a request comprising information about a plurality of call destinations and associated time ranges - in fact it makes no mention of time ranges or association of time ranges with a plurality of destinations; and column 4, lines 31 to 62 does not disclose comparison of the current time with the associated time ranges or the selection of one of the call destinations based on the outcome of the comparison or establishing a call to the selected destination - indeed, it makes no mention of comparing time ranges with the current time or selection of any call destination based on the comparison. Linden et al. is similarly silent regarding these aspects of the independent claims. Thus, the combination of the subject-matter of these two references does not result in the invention defined by the independent claims, the subject-matter of which is therefore non-obvious.


In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the independent claims are neither anticipated by, or rendered obvious by, the prior art and are patentable thereover. As the remaining claims depend from the independent claims, those claims are submitted to be allowable, as well.

Therefore, while the indicated allowability of Claims 8 and 28 is gratefully acknowledged, it is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance, and the Examiner's further and favorable reconsideration in that regard is urged.

As this response is being sent during the fourth month following the Examiner's Office Action, an appropriate Petition for Extension of Time is also submitted herewith.

May 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William M. Lee, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line.

William M. Lee, Jr.  
Registration No. 26,935  
Barnes & Thornburg LLP  
P.O. Box 2786  
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786  
(312) 214-4800  
(312) 759-5646 (fax)